REMARKS

According to the present office action, claims 1-16 and claims 18-34 are pending in the application. Specifically, claims 1-2, 6, 8-15, 18-21, 23, 26, 28-29, and 33-34 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious under U.S. Patent No. 5,727,135 ("Webb et al."). Claims 3-5, 16, 22, 24-25, 27, and 30-32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious under Webb et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,367,628 ("Ote"). Finally, claim 7 is rejected under Webb et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,850,471 ("Brett").

In-Person Interview, July 19, 2007

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the in-person interview conducted on July 19, 2007, with James Strom (Reg. No. 45,278) and the undersigned. At the interview, Applicant discussed features of the claims that relate to virtualization. In particular, Applicant discussed how various features of the claims operate within emulated or virtualized environments residing on a single host, which allow multiple operating systems to operate on a single host at the same time (some may be in a state of suspended operation, or some may be operating at the same time).

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The primary reference, Webb, is for emulating on a host the interface of a network printer. Nothing in Webb suggests running multiple operating systems on one host. Nothing Webb suggests emulating or virtualizing multiple machine environments on a single host.

Webb displays the interface of a remote printer with a special GUI program 53 on that runs on host/server 11 (col. 7, lines 54-57). The GUI program "use[s] convention Microsoft Windows [APIs] to paint the screen 13 of host 11 with … the [printer] operator panel replica 35' " (col. 7, lines 59-64). This host 11 receives NPAP (Network Printer Alliance Protocol) packets from a printer and uses information (information about printer state and commands) in those packets to display the replica 35' to appear the same as the printer's actual control panel.

Webb does not teach or suggest "a host operating system suitable for displaying a graphical user interface", and "multiple operating systems running in environments emulated

by one or more emulator programs running on the host operating system" (claim 1). Nor does Webb teach "multiple emulated virtual machines being emulated by one or more emulator programs running on the host operating system" (claim 8).

Other independent claims have similar features. For example, claim 11 recites "multiple computer systems running in virtual machine environments". Claim 12 recites "multiple computer systems in virtual machine environments and executing on a single computer system". Claim 21 recites "providing a plurality of virtual machines and respective operating systems on the host computer, each virtual machine comprising a virtualized computer environment hosting a corresponding one of the operating systems on the host computer". Claim 23 recites "providing a first virtual machine and a second virtual machine configured for concurrent execution on the host computer". Claim 30 recites a "method performed in a computer configured with a plurality of virtual machines and software for managing the virtual machines". Claim 33 recites "virtual machines configured to host concurrently executable operating systems on a host computer".

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In so far as the dependent claims incorporate limitation from these independent claims, they also patentably define over the cited art. Thus, applicants submit that all the pending claims, 1- 16 and claims 18-34 define over the cited art and are in condition for allowance.

Should the examiner have any questions or concerns, the undersigned can be contacted at 206-903-2461.

Date: August 10, 2007   / Grzegorz S. Plichta /
                                               Grzegorz S. Plichta
                                               Registration No. 55,541

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439